

Interactive comment on “HESS Opinions: Repeatable research: what hydrologists can learn from the Duke cancer research scandal” by Michael N. Fienen and Mark Bakker

Michael N. Fienen and Mark Bakker

mnfienen@usgs.gov

Received and published: 6 June 2016

We appreciate the response from Dr. Wolfgang Nowak on our Opinion Paper. We are glad that he interpreted our intent to highlight the value of a documented path from original data, through analysis and modeling, to forecasts or model results. We appreciate that Dr. Nowak recognized we were not simply implying open-source software was the answer. Nonetheless, in response to the other review, and at the suggestion of Dr. Nowak, we will revise the paper to make that clearer and hopefully avoid the misunderstanding of our conclusions as "use open source and all is fine."

The second recommendation from Dr. Nowak was to disclaim the fact that we are addressing only one issue (data provenance and auditable pathways through data and

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



analysis) but there are others that can enhance transparency. This is a good point, and we will revise the paper to incorporate a bit more context in that way.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., doi:10.5194/hess-2016-215, 2016.

HESSD

Interactive
comment

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

